



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

of the desecration wrought by Antiochus Epiphanes—a supposition which does not seem highly probable.

The book will have little influence on the trend of opinion.

WM. R. SHOEMAKER

MENOMINEE, MICH.

**A Manual of Theology.** By JOSEPH AGAR BEET. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1906. Pp. xvi + 559. \$2.75.

Dr. Beet's theology shows very slight influence of modern scholarship, so far as its structure and method are concerned. To be sure, he refuses to attempt to establish the infallibility of Scripture; but his use of the Bible is precisely what it would have been if he had affirmed infallibility. He professes to rest his conclusions on the results of impartial historical study. But throughout the treatise there is the attempt to "harmonize" the teachings of the Bible so as to produce a consistent theological system. Although he devotes forty pages to an examination of the origin and authorship of the books of the Bible, he decides the trustworthiness of the Old Testament by an appeal to the infallibility of the New Testament. "This compels us to believe either that the Old Testament is substantially true, or that they to whom the Incarnate Son intrusted the gospel of salvation were in serious error, touching the ancient records to which they constantly appealed." Thus, after all, the criterion for Dr. Beet is not the result of historical investigation, but the authority of scriptural writers.

Accordingly, we find theology presented as a summary of biblical teachings, collected by the traditional manner of proof-texts. The historicity of Adam and the Adamic origin of sin are not questioned. From reading Dr. Beet's book, no one would suppose that these had ever been questioned. The retention of the word "person" in the doctrine of the Trinity leads to an undisguised tritheism. The central doctrine of theology for Dr. Beet is the physical resurrection of Christ. This life is a probation looking toward the life to come. More than one-sixth of the entire space is devoted to the discussion of events lying beyond the grave. An entire chapter is devoted to the doctrine of angels. Thus the reader is consistently kept in the realm of the supernatural, and theology is regarded as a description of the details of that supernatural realm on the basis of an inspired book which conveys information otherwise unaccessible.

Dr. Beet's well-known views as to the nature of the Christian life and the conditions of immortality find here a full exposition. The religious tone of the treatise prevents it from being a dry compendium of proof-texts.

But one who has accepted the historical method of studying the Bible will be unable to use the book for anything more than an expression of Dr. Beet's own convictions.

GERALD BIRNEY SMITH.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

**Special Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament.** By FRANCIS E. GIGOT. Part II, Didactic Books and Prophetical Writings. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1906. Pp. 505. \$2 net.

The earlier works of Gigot, covering general introduction and biblical history, have largely determined his method, general position, and spirit. He belongs to the progressive wing of the Roman Catholic church, but is cautious enough not to go beyond the bounds of securing the *imprimatur* of the archbishop of New York, inscribed on the back of the title-page of this volume.

The large amount of space (500 pages) devoted to the treatment of the didactic and prophetic writings is due to the care with which the author sets forth the pros and cons on every disputed question of authorship. It is very evident that Gigot is distinctively progressive in his own thinking; but his method of presenting the arguments on any disputed question—for example, the authorship and date of Isaiah, chaps. 40-66, and of Daniel—leaves the reader, as a rule, suspended in mid-air. In other words, he is so non-committal that only an expert can detect his position.

In thus presenting both sides—the conservative first, and the radical second—he is doing a valuable service for biblical study. He is thus almost always sympathetically arranging in order the best reasons for a historical and modern view of Old Testament literature. Merely the reading of these arguments will set forth their reasonableness to thoughtful readers, and give them to a public that probably would not otherwise find them.

The extreme caution of the author may be seen in his discussion of Daniel. He says (p. 348): "Hence the date of the Book of Daniel is 570-536." But after thirty pages of discussion of the arguments for a late authorship, he says (p. 379): "Catholic writers generally are reluctant to depart from the time-honored opinion that Daniel is the author of the book which bears his name."

The book will serve its purpose well, viz.: to promulgate among Romanists a broader, larger conception of biblical criticism. The modern, up-to-date Protestant biblical student will find little that will be of value in his views of Old Testament introduction.

IRA M. PRICE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO